

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see Appeal Brief, filed September 14, 2008, with respect to claims 1-15 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The U.S.C. 102 (e) rejection of claims 1-5 and 7-20, and the U.S.C. 103 (a) rejection of claim 6 has been withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

2. **Claims 1-15** are allowed.

3. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Consider **claims 1 and 11**, the most relevant prior art of record, Howe (US 6,615,381 B1), fails to specifically show, disclose, or suggest assigning the MDN providing local calling access to the MCD from the base address for the MCD, in the selected wireless rate center encompassing the base address, to the MCD.

Howe clearly shows and discloses method for providing local call access to the MCD from a base address for the MCD (a system for optimizing the routing of a call originated from a land-based terminal **43** to a wireless mobile terminal **47**, utilizing the interaction between a server controlled Internet protocol network and the home location register (HLR) **53** of the mobile terminal. In response to a call request by the server, the HLR identifies the visited location register (VLR) **57** in contact with the mobile terminal and obtains a temporary local directory number (TLDN) of the local serving switch in

Art Unit: 2617

contact with a mobile data unit connected to the mobile terminal. The server uses the TLDN to reach a data unit on the network, which is used to place a local call over the public switched telephone network (PSTN) to the serving switch [abstract]], selecting a wireless rate center encompassing the base address and having an MDN providing local call access to the MCD from the base address for the MCD (searching the internal database of the HLR to determine the VLR last in contact with the mobile terminal [column 3 lines 37-39]).

Howe, however, lacks the claimed feature of assigning the MDN providing local calling access to the MCD from the base address for the MCD, in the selected wireless rate center encompassing the base address, to the MCD, therefore this limitation, in conjunction with all the recited limitations of claims 1 and 11, is novel and unobvious over Howe, alone or in combination with all the cited art of record.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAIME HOLLIDAY whose telephone number is

Art Unit: 2617

(571)272-8618. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30am to 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Appiah can be reached on (571) 272-7904. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jaime M Holliday/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/Charles N. Appiah/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617